

{In Archive} Re: Clearance related question Yes

01/06/2012 04:16 PM

David Olszyk to: Priscilla Hoobler

Cc: Nathan Schumaker

Archive:

This message is being viewed in an archive.

I approve of Nathan using the other agency peer reviewers. Nathan, just find out who those people are and send them our form to sign. If there are at least two that would be best because if this isn't a peer reviewed journal article it falls into the "gray literature" report area and would need 2 peer reviewers. If we can get the pieces I think we can move this forward. I will facilitate this as it is a feather in Nathan's cap as contributing to an important area. But it does have policy implications so we need to alert the proper people through Tom.

Dave

Priscilla Hoobler I agree that it needs to be cleared. I don't think... 01/06/2012 04:02:59 PM

From: Priscilla Hoobler/COR/USEPA/US David Olszyk/COR/USEPA/US@EPA To: Nathan Schumaker/COR/USEPA/US@EPA Cc:

01/06/2012 04:02 PM Date:

Subject: Re: Clearance-related question

I agree that it needs to be cleared. I don't think we can use their clearance. But, if Daye agrees, you can use their reviewers and reviews for our clearance. If you can't have the disclaimer added - just document it in the file.

We can try to get it done rapidly but if it has policy implications then the clearance must be approved by NHEERL after Tom. We'll need a fact sheet and cover memo. I can give Rebecca Daniels, the NHEERL TIM, a heads up that it needs to be rushed. Also maybe Tom can mention that as well before we send it forward.

We'll need a fact sheet

Priscilla Hoobler Information Services Specialist ORD/NHEERL/WED

Phone: 541-754-4389 Fax: 541-754-4716 200 SW 35th St. Corvallis, OR 97333

David Olszyk Nathan, If you are a coauthor, especially if this is... 01/06/2012 03:54:31 PM

From: David Olszyk/COR/USEPA/US

Nathan Schumaker/COR/USEPA/US@EPA To: Priscilla Hoobler/COR/USEPA/US@EPA Cc:

01/06/2012 03:54 PM Date:

Re: Clearance-related question Subject:

Nathan,

If you are a coauthor, especially if this is considered to be a methods paper will likely be used for policy

purposes, I think it needs to be cleared. But since another agency is also clearing it you may be able to use their clearance, or at a minimum, use their peer reviewers' comments for our clearance to speed things up. How the other agency uses it may be up to them.

Priscilla, do you have a take on this? If it needs clearance can we do it rapidly?

Thanks, Dave

Nathan Schumaker Hi Dave, As you know, I'm part of the USFS mo... 01/06/2012 03:36:58 PM

From: Nathan Schumaker/COR/USEPA/US
To: David Olszyk/COR/USEPA/US@EPA

Date: 01/06/2012 03:36 PM Subject: Clearance-related question

Hi Dave.

As you know, I'm part of the USFS modeling team that's helping to develop the recovery strategy and critical habitat designation for the northern spotted owl. The critical habitat rule has been put on an even faster fast-track by the White House, and as part of the process, my modeling team colleagues are developing a methods paper that'll accompany the other critical habitat information online at the US FWS web site. I just got a first draft of the methods paper today, and it looks like I'll be a co-author.

Given that its not being published in the traditional sense, and its being cleared (or somehow blessed from very high up) by US FWS, do I need to do a separate EPA clearance? I seriously doubt that it will be possible to attach the EPA disclaimer to this document. Its not going to have an acknowledgments section, and its devoted strictly to explaining methods. Basically, its a white-paper, not a publication...

Any ideas...?

Nathan